

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 173 320

SP 014 381

AUTHOR Rosenblatt, Ronald R.; Parish, Thomas S.
 TITLE The Relationship of Human Values to Perceived Teaching Styles.
 PUB DATE Aug 78
 NOTE 16p.
 EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
 DESCRIPTORS Behavior Patterns; *Educational Strategies; Personality Studies; *Personal Values; *Social Values; *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Behavior; *Teaching Styles; Teaching Techniques

ABSTRACT

The relationship between a teacher's human values orientation and individual teaching style is explored. Undergraduate education majors were asked to complete the Teaching Style Q-Sort instrument containing 16 statements about teacher behavior, identifying each as most like or unlike their own style. The subjects were also asked to respond to the Rokeach Value Survey identifying those social and personal values they held in most and least esteem. An analysis of the results of this study indicated a tentative relationship between teaching styles and individual values. A number of specific values showed significant differences in ranking across teaching styles. (JD)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

-ED173320

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Ronald R.

Rosenblatt

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

THE RELATIONSHIP OF HUMAN VALUES TO
PERCEIVED TEACHING STYLES

by

Ronald R. Rosenblatt, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
College of Education
Kansas State University

Thomas S. Parish, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
College of Education
Kansas State University

August 14, 1978

ABSTRACT

The last decade has seen educational researchers make real progress in defining, determining and analyzing teaching styles. Concurrently, interest and research expertise in documenting individual values has also increased. This study was undertaken to gather baseline data on the relationship between personal values of educators and their professed teaching style.

The sample consisted of 162 undergraduate education majors. Based upon the results of the Teaching Style Q-Sort (Heikkinen, 1977), and instrument designed to classify each subject as to perceived teaching style, a statistical analysis was performed upon each of the thirty-six human values (Rokeach, 1973) ranked by the subjects. The researchers found that a number of specific values showed significant differences in ranking across teaching styles.

THE RELATIONSHIP OF HUMAN VALUES TO PERCEIVED TEACHING STYLE

Since the beginnings of formal education, teachers have attempted to isolate, describe, and define the perfect model of instruction. It is highly unlikely that such attempts shall be successful. However, as a by-product of this quest, a myraid of theoretical models have been put forth in an attempt to characterize normal classroom teacher behaviors. "Good" or "effective" teachers have been classified and categorized according to numerous dichotomous scales (e.g. structured vs unstructured, flexible vs unflexible, innovative vs traditional, and so on).

The classifying of teaching strategies has become almost a parlor game. We are exposed to "inquiry" teachers, "inductive" teaching, "process-oriented" studies, "moral" education, teachers who "emphasize the affective domain," who "encourage personal development," and curriculums which "develop interpersonal awareness." Each of these descriptions assumes the existence of some specific, recognizable process of working with students which abets their learning to a greater extent than any other process.

Unfortunately, although a multitude of research studies have been undertaken to compare teaching methods, the resultant data is, at best, inconclusive, at worst, incomprehensible. Little or no difference has been consistently reported for any particular method or technique. In effect, educational theorists, researchers, and practitioners have been unable to identify that one reliable, ever appropriate instructional strategy that could be proclaimed and confidently implemented as the best available alternative.

Perhaps educational researchers are at fault for their inability to create evaluation devices sensitive enough to determine the best approach to teaching. Or perhaps the "best" is a relative, situation-specific term. Is it inconceivable that a wealth of attractive varieties of instruction exists? Is it also inconceivable that individual development (the basis for ultimate evaluation) may be keyed to the development of a conducive environment for personal growth?

To this goal, Hunt (1974) has illuminated the need for matching teaching styles to learning styles, as a means of providing for the most efficient use of available resources and personnel. However, in order to accomplish this goal, a carefully conceived and developed classification scheme must be determined.

Joyce and Weil (1972), after extensive examination of the work of more than 80 theorists, schools, and projects, grouped the various remaining models into specific families which symbolize various orientations toward man and his universe. Essentially, these four families may be defined as follows (Joyce and Weil, 1972):

1. Social Interaction: In this family the relationships of an individual to his society and of one's direct interactions with other people are emphasized. Priority is given to social relations and the creation of a better society through group interaction and communication.
2. Information-Processing: This family is concerned with how the students can improve their information-processing abilities. Information-processing refers to the ways in which people handle stimuli from the environment, arrange data, identify

problems, generate concepts and solutions to problems, and employ verbal and nonverbal symbols.

3. Personal: The most notable feature of this category is its focus upon personal development as a source of educational ideas. This family is often characterized by such individually oriented constructs as personal psychology, emotional life, self concept, self image, and creativity.
4. Behavioral Modification: These theories rely on changing the observable behavior of the child and describing him or her in terms of this extremely visible behavior as opposed to the underlying and unobservable behavior.

Recognizing the need for a procedure to ascertain the instructional style of educators, Heikkinen (1977) developed the Teaching Style Q-Sort (TSQS) based upon the four families of instruction described by Joyce and Weil (1972). His studies modified and refined this instrument to the extent that it accurately categorizes teaching styles according to the Joyce and Weil model.

Validity for the TSQS was established by a variety of means including factor analysis of the statements that make up the Q-sort, judging the content validity of the statements, and testing the TSQS on students of classes trained to use one of the families. Factor analysis suggests that the statements that make up the Q-sort do fit together into families as described in the Joyce and Weil model. The class that judged the content validity of the TSQS was able to correctly match 90% of the statements with the family they represented. The classes trained to use behavior modification techniques had scores for the family that were

significantly (0.01) higher than the average for that family for all teachers (Heikkinen, 1977).

Reliability information for the TSQS took two forms. Test-retest data was significant (0.01) for all families ranging from 0.44 to 0.65. Item-total correlations showed that all of the items were significantly (0.01) correlated with the families that they represented (Heikkinen, 1977).

The development of the TSQS is a major step in the overall analysis of instruction. It provides the educational researcher with an effective tool for examining and possibly isolating those variables responsible for dictating individual teaching style.

Ultimately this study attempted to determine if a statistically significant relationship exists between one's perceived teaching style and one's human values orientation. At the heart of this research was the question:

Does an individual's human values orientation have a significant relationship to the individual's perceived teaching style?

Human values orientation was selected as a likely variable to be investigated due to the many studies alluding to the importance of values to human behavior (Williams, 1968; Allport, Vernon, & Lindzey, 1960; Kluckhohn, 1951; and Kohlberg, 1964). Perhaps more than any other concept, human values promised to help explain different teaching styles as functions of human behavior. If one accepts the notion that a human value is a constant belief that a particular example of conduct is personally or socially preferable to its anti-thesis, then it is not illogical to suggest

that teaching style as a purposeful, rational mode of behavior may be directly related to one's value system; that organization or beliefs regarding preferred personal and social conduct and oriented by relative importance.

The Rokeach Value Survey contains two sets of 18 values each which are to be ranked according to individual priority. One set is composed on instrumental values which imply codes of conduct, and the other consists of terminal values which describe end-states of existence (Rokeach, 1973).

The terminal scale evolved from values suggested in the literature as well as those suggested by over 130 individuals. The resulting list was then pared down by eliminating similar values, those that were too specific, those which overlapped, and those which were not, in fact, terminal values (Rokeach, 1973). The instrumental values were condensed in much the same manner, beginning with Anderson's (1968) list of 550 personality-trait terms. Following the construction of the lists, extensive work was done with a large number of samples in order to document the reliability of the survey. Median test-retest reliabilities for terminal values ranged from .62 to .80 across eight groups; for instrumental values the corresponding reliabilities were .53 to .72. A group of 204 college students were retested at 14 to 16 month intervals with reliabilities of .69 and .61 (Rokeach, 1973).

Since its development the Rokeach Value Survey has been used on a wide variety of groups and problems. The values of Americans in general have been tabulated (Rokeach, 1973) as well as changes in those values over time (Rokeach, 1974). Rokeach and Parker (1970) explored values of blacks and whites. Value difference by age was explored by Beech and

Schoeppe (1970). Studies relating values to attitudes such as racism, feelings toward the poor, international affairs and religion are reported by Rokeach (1973). Similarly, Rokeach reports a number of studies linking values and behavior. The wide application of the survey to attitudes and behavior suggest that it is appropriate for use in determining if there are correlations between values and preferred teaching style.

Procedure

In order to answer the question of this study, 36 statistical hypotheses were tested at the .05 level of confidence:

1. There is no statistically significant difference in the median score for the value, Ambitious*, among the five treatment groups.

* The 35 additional statistical hypotheses result from substituting the following values in the above hypothesis.

Broadminded	A Comfortable Life
Capable	An Exciting Life
Cheerful	A Sense of Accomplishment
Clear	A World at Peace
Courageous	A World of Beauty
Forgiving	Equality
Helpful	Family Security
Honest	Happiness
Imaginative	Freedom
Independent	Inner Harmony
Intellectual	Mature Love
Logical	National Security
Loving	Pleasure
Obedient	Salvation
Polite	Self-Respect
Responsible	Social Recognition
Self-controlled	True Friendship
	Wisdom

The sample consisted of 162 subjects. All of the subjects were undergraduate students enrolled in a required course in the teacher education program.

All of the subjects were asked to complete the Teaching Style Q-Sort instrument. This entailed the analysis and subsequent categorization of sixteen statements about teacher behavior. The subjects placed each statement appropriately along a seven-step continuum from "most like my teaching" to "most unlike my teaching." The scale allowed for only one statement at each extreme gradually increasing to four statements at the center. Each step of the scale was assigned a point value in order to determine the dominant teaching style of the individual. All of the subjects were provided enough time to complete the TSQS to their own satisfaction.

Upon the completion of the TSQS, each subject was administered the Rokeach Value Survey. This instrument provided eighteen instrumental and eighteen terminal values to be prioritized separately.

The two instruments were enclosed together in a packet for each subject. This procedure ensured that an individual's responses on the TSQS could be related to that individual's responses on the Value Survey.

The data thus collected was then analyzed for group differences. Based upon each subject's score on the TSQS, five categories of teaching style were identified. These consisted of the four families described by Joyce and Weil and a fifth style, eclectic. The eclectic group was composed of those individuals whose score on the TSQS did not place them in any of the four families. Therefore, prior to proceeding with the analysis of the Rokeach Value Survey, all subjects had to be classified into one of

the five characteristic teaching groups, social interaction, information processing, personal source, behavioral modification, or eclectic.

Once accomplished, these five groups became the treatment groups to be analyzed for values differences. Tests of significance, using the Program Valuetest (Sociological Data Processing Center), were performed. This program lists median ranks and composite ranks for each subgroup or category and computes a median test (Siegal, 1956) statistic along with its associated probability level for each of the 36 values.

Results

Upon concluding the accumulation of data, the aforementioned statistical test was administered to each of the 36 human values. The findings revealed significant differences to exist with six values (four instrumental, two terminal).

Among the instrumental values (Table I), the prioritization of broad-minded was found to be significantly different among the teaching style groups. The information processing group mean prioritization was 11.8(13) while the social interaction group showed 5.2(3).

In addition some meaningful significant differences appear among the groups as reflected by the instrumental values, capable, courageous, and honest. The information processing group indicates capable to be a highly important value, registering a group mean of 6.1(6). However, at the same time, the behavioral modification group prioritized capable as not nearly so important, showing a group mean of 11.8(13). Similarly, courageous seems to be far more important to the behavioral modification group, 5.8(4), than to the social interaction group, 12.2(13). In the case of honest,

the probability level of the test of significance was .05, indicating a significant difference, although the mean differences are, at first appearance, not appreciative. Apparently, the variances involved are quite small. However, it appears that the behavioral modification group holds honest to be a significantly more important value than does the social interaction group.

TABLE I

Instrumental Value Means and Composite Ranks for Five Teaching Style Families

	Personal Source	Social Interaction	Information Processing	Behavioral Modification	Eclectic	
N =	32	33	28	19	50	p*
Ambitious	9.1(10)	10.2(11)	6.2(7)	8.2(8)	10.2(10)	—
Broadminded	8.5(8)	5.2(3)	11.8(13)	6.7(6)	5.8(4)	.01
Capable	11.2(12)	6.0(5)	6.1(6)	11.8(13)	9.7(8)	.05
Cheerful	9.7(11)	10.5(12)	10.1(10)	9.7(10)	7.9(7)	—
Clean	15.5(17)	15.8(16)	13.8(16)	15.5(17)	15.0(17)	—
Courageous	8.4(7)	12.2(13)	9.6(9)	5.8(4)	12.2(16)	.05
Forgiving	7.1(9)	8.8(7)	12.8(14)	8.6(9)	6.7(5)	—
Helpful	5.8(3)	7.2(6)	13.6(15)	6.2(5)	10.0(9)	—
Honest	4.7(2)	6.0(4)	3.8(2)	2.5(1)	2.7(1)	.05
Imaginative	12.2(14)	12.6(15)	8.9(8)	13.2(15)	11.5(14)	—
Independent	6.4(4)	9.3(9)	5.9(4)	7.3(7)	6.8(6)	—
Intellectual	11.4(13)	9.0(8)	11.6(12)	10.6(11)	11.5(15)	—
Logical	13.5(15)	10.1(10)	10.3(11)	12.1(14)	10.7(12)	—
Loving	7.6(5)	5.1(2)	5.5(3)	5.5(3)	5.3(3)	—
Obedient	17.0(18)	17.3(18)	14.8(18)	16.8(18)	17.2(18)	—
Polite	14.0(16)	15.9(17)	13.9(17)	13.4(16)	10.4(11)	—
Responsible	4.1(1)	4.7(1)	3.4(1)	4.8(2)	4.3(2)	—
Self-controlled	8.1(6)	12.5(14)	6.0(5)	10.8(12)	11.0(13)	—

*Kruskal-Wallis Test (Siegel, 1956). Significance of differences are shown here only for the two means showing the largest differences.

TABLE II

Terminal Value Means and Composite Ranks for Five Teaching Style Families

	Personal Source	Social Interaction	Information Processing	Behavioral Modification	Eclectic	
N =	32	33	28	19	50	p*
A comfortable life	12.1(14)	13.8(15)	11.7(12)	12.9(14)	14.5(16)	—
An exciting life	10.7(10)	9.6(10)	10.3(11)	10.1(11)	9.3(10)	—
A sense of accomplishment	5.9(6)	7.2(6)	8.2(8)	9.8(10)	7.4(8)	—
A world of peace	10.9(12)	11.2(12)	13.2(14)	7.2(7)	11.7(12)	—
A world of beauty	11.6(13)	10.3(11)	13.1(13)	15.8(17)	13.6(14)	—
Equality	10.9(11)	11.8(13)	14.6(17)	4.7(2)	11.0(11)	.01
Family security	5.6(5)	5.5(2)	3.0(1)	5.6(3)	3.8(1)	—
Freedom	5.5(4)	6.1(3)	7.0(4)	6.1(5)	6.7(6)	—
Happiness	5.3(3)	8.4(8)	7.6(5)	8.1(8)	5.1(4)	—
Inner Harmony	4.4(1)	6.4(4)	6.1(3)	4.2(1)	4.0(3)	—
Mature love	6.4(7)	9.2(9)	8.3(9)	12.5(13)	8.6(9)	—
National security	15.5(17)	15.7(17)	15.5(18)	16.2(18)	16.0(18)	.05
Pleasure	15.1(15)	11.9(14)	14.6(14)	11.0(12)	12.0(13)	—
Salvation	15.9(18)	16.2(18)	13.5(15)	14.5(16)	15.5(17)	—
Self-respect	4.5(2)	4.5(1)	3.2(2)	5.8(4)	4.2(2)	—
Social recognition	15.3(16)	14.2(16)	9.1(10)	14.3(15)	11.5(15)	—
True friendship	8.9(9)	6.8(5)	8.1(7)	6.5(6)	7.5(5)	—
Wisdom	7.0(8)	7.9(7)	7.7(6)	8.2(9)	7.2(7)	—

*Kruskal-Wallis Test (Siegel, 1956). Significance of differences are shown here only for the two means showing the largest differences.

Among the terminal values (Table II), statistical significance was found among the groups concerning the value, equality. The behavioral modification group appears to regard equality as an extremely important value, 4.7(2), while the information processing group seems to attach little importance to this value, 14.6(17).

DISCUSSION

Among the terminal values, equality immediately stands out as differentiating between some teaching styles. Rokeach (1973) found that this value was held in higher esteem by blacks than whites and it may be that similar forces are operating among certain teachers. Heikkinen found that special education teachers were more likely to prefer behavior modification as a teaching style. Because of their association with handicapped people and the attitudes towards them, special educators may place a higher value on equality. On the other hand, those teachers who feel that schools exist to transmit information probably would be expected to prefer a system where students are differentiated by academic performance, where competition is approved and superiority is lauded.

Equality also is interesting in terms of the composite ranking of the entire sample as compared with the value placed on freedom. The latter was ranked fifth overall, while equality was eleventh. When interpreted in light of Rokeach's findings of black values, there may be implications for educators attempting to find solutions to educational problems in the inner cities.

The first five composite terminal values, in descending order, were self-respect, family security, inner harmony, happiness, and freedom. If subsequent research verifies that these values are important to most

teachers, those people who feel that schools do not do a good job in transmitting these values to students may have to look at areas other than teacher values to determine the reason.

Among the instrumental values, the high placing of courageous by the behavior modification group may be again related to their contact with handicapped students. The results for broadminded are predictable in that one would expect teachers concerned primarily with information (facts) to see no particular need for broadmindedness. Conversely, it could also be predicted that information processors would value capability, and this is borne out by the results. The high ranking of capability by those who favor social interaction may result from their concern with effective group process. In addition, the significant importance placed upon the value, broadmindedness, by the social interaction group may be explained by the concepts of effective group dynamics. Indeed, effective groups are generally characterized by the free expression of ideas, subsequent objective evaluation and assessment, and finally rational decision-making based upon consensus or compromise (Cartwright and Zander, 1960).

Specific relationships between teaching styles and individual values must, at this point, be regarded as very tentative. The results do seem, however, to be of sufficient strength to justify further research in this area.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, N. H. Likeableness ratings of 555 personality-trait words. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 1968, v9, 272 - 279.
- Beech, R. P. and Schoeppe, A. A. A developmental study of value systems in adolescence. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Psychological Association, Miami Beach, FL, 1970.
- Cartwright, D. and Zander, A. Group Dynamics, New York: Harper and Row, 1960.
- Heikkinen, M. W. "The Teaching Style Q-Sort and Its Use in Examining Relationships Between Teaching Style and Selected Teacher Variables." Unpublished dissertation, University of Idaho, 1977.
- Hunt, D. E. Matching models in education. Monograph Series Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1974, 10.
- Joyce, B. R. and Weil, M. Models of teaching. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1972.
- Rokeach, M. The Nature of Human Values. New York: The Free Press, 1973.
- Rokeach, M. Change and stability in American value systems. The Public Opinion Quarterly, 1974, v. 38, 222 - 238.
- Rokeach, M. and Parker, S. Values as social indicators of poverty and race relations in America. The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 1970, v. 388, 97 - 111.